

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated April 2, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 5, 2007. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-2, 4-13 and 15-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-13 and 15-20 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 19-20 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph, as "the user data" lacks antecedent basis.

Applicants have amended claims 19 and 20 to change "the user data" to "the set of data," thus addressing the lack of antecedent basis. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7-13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C (a) as being anticipated by *Bays* (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,603).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9

USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Bays* does not teach each and every element of the claims. For example, *Bays* does not teach generating a linking value identifying the portion of the set of data associated with annotation records, as recited in independent claims 1 and 12. Independent claims 9 and 17 recite similar limitations.

In the *Office Action*, the Examiner argues that “generating a linking value identifying the portion of the set of data associated with the annotation records” is disclosed by *Bays*, Col. 3, Lines 48-53, which states:

For annotation entry, an annotatable data item is chosen (e.g. a 5th cell in column y of spreadsheet z) and an annotation is entered and stored. The annotation is associated with the annotatable data item at the time of entry by including pointer information to the annotatable data item with the annotation.

Here, the Examiner argues that the recited “linking value” is disclosed by the “pointer information” described in *Bays*. Applicants respectfully point out that, as described in the above citation, *Bays* teaches that the pointer information is included in the annotation “*at the time of entry*” of the annotation. Thus, *Bays* does not teach generating a linking value for annotation records that are retrieved by querying an annotation store, as recited in the present claims.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that *Bays* does not teach “returning an annotation data structure comprising a field containing the linking value and a field containing the consolidated data,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 12. Independent claims 9 and 17 recite similar limitations. As illustrated in Figures 4A-4B and described in paragraphs [0040-0042] of the present application, returning an annotation data structure (item 430) comprising generated linking values (items 426) and fields containing consolidated data (items 428), as claimed, allows annotations that would conventionally appear on multiple rows of data results to be consolidated into a

single row of data results. For example, the two annotations included in the rows 424₁ and 424₂ shown in Figure 4A may be consolidated into a single field of row 428₁ shown in Figure 4B. In contrast, there is no teaching of consolidating annotations into one field in *Bays*, or any similar type of consolidation of annotations at all.

Accordingly, Applicants submit claims 1, 9, 12 and 17, as well as their dependents, are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bays* in view of official notice. These claims depend from claim 1 which Applicants submit is allowable for reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants submit these claims are also allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Randol Read, attorney, at (713) 623-4844, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/

Randol W. Read

Registration No. 43,876

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicants